

net.work.Maryland Advisory Group  
Monthly Meeting  
June 18, 2002 10:00 am – 2:00 pm  
Chesapeake College  
Wye Mills, Maryland

---

**ADVISORY GROUP ATTENDEES:**

Linda Burek (Chair)  
Margo Burnette (Vice Chair)  
Richard Aldridge  
Walter Bigalow (Alt. for J. Wood)  
Chuck Bristow  
Mary Clapsaddle  
Ron Forsythe  
Michael McCarty

Bob McGrory  
Steve Molner (**ex-officio member**)  
William Morrow  
Susan Ockert (Alt. for L. Powell)  
Lewis Powell  
Richard Rose  
Pat Wallace  
Renee Winsky

**DBM STAFF ATTENDEES:**

Terry Conroy  
Jodey McGhee

**OTHER GOVERNMENT ATTENDEES:**

Steve McHenry  
Mary Row Walkup  
Philip Shockley  
Steve Molnar





Reported By:	Topic / Discussion	Action	Completion Date
	any public speaking engagements to make sure uniform message is delivered.	presentation on the working web site.	
P. Wallace	<b><u>By-Laws / Policy Committee – Charter Revisions</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “Board” to “Advisory Group”</li> <li>▪ Article I - generalized at department level</li> <li>▪ Article II - no changes</li> <li>▪ Article III <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Added Responsibility to Communicate to Stakeholders (Article III. Section 3)</li> <li>o Proxy Vote (Article III. Section 4D &amp; Section 7)</li> <li>o 2/3 Vote to Amend Charter &amp; Change Group (Article III. Section 4E &amp; Article IV. Section 1)</li> <li>o Five-Day Rule (Article III. Section 5, 8C, 8D, 8G &amp; Article IV. Section 6.)</li> <li>o Added Meeting Agenda Guideline (Article III. Section 8C)</li> <li>o Special Meetings (Article III. Section 8D)</li> <li>o Virtual Attendance (Article III. Section 8E)</li> <li>o Added Guidelines for Addressing the Advisory Group (Article III. Section 8G)</li> <li>o Added Open Meetings Adherence (Article III. Section 8H)</li> <li>o Added Article IV - Committees</li> <li>o Recognized Standing and Special Committees</li> <li>o Special &amp; Emergency Meetings</li> <li>o Records (Section 8)</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Added Article V – Amendments</li> <li>▪ Added Article VI - Robert’s Rules</li> <li>▪ Added Article VII - Repeal of Provisions</li> <li>▪ Added Article VIII - Acceptance of Charter</li> </ul>	<p>Strike “committee” from policy.</p> <p>Margo to distribute agenda 5 days prior to the meeting.</p> <p>Advisory Group does not legally have to be open; leave 8H since the wording exempts the Group.</p> <p>Publish Advisory Group meeting minutes after approval. Publish presentation after meeting (add disclaimer to first slide.)</p> <p>Motion passed to take minutes/actions at formal committee meetings.</p> <p>Change Article IV, section 1 to state “Chair or designee.”</p> <p>Add mission &amp; goals to the policy. Chairs to forward to Pat.</p> <p>By-Laws approved as discussed.</p>	
M. McCarty	<b><u>Requirements Committee - Network Maryland will:</u></b>	Develop 2 documents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Compilation of all input.</li> </ul>	

Reported By:	Topic / Discussion	Action	Completion Date
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Be designed to specifications supporting the first four levels of the OSI model - elements included in the higher levels of the model will be the responsibility of the end user(s)</li> <li>▪ Support all IP based services and will be designed to include support for all network based open standards</li> <li>▪ Be designed so that the network core will support IP (no requirement for the core to be IP, ATM or any other specific technology)</li> <li>▪ Ensure that the local loop will support connectivity of IP, Frame and ATM</li> <li>▪ Cost less than the combination of current ISP Services, cross LATA connectivity, local loop &amp; network management, while at the same time providing "at a minimum" the same level of service as is available today</li> <li>▪ Support out of band management capability</li> <li>▪ Have a core design that can grow to support increasing traffic loads</li> <li>▪ Be easy to implement (single point of vendor contact)</li> <li>▪ Provide a single point of entry to Network Maryland in each LATA (assumes that local loops can be provided based upon distance insensitive pricing)</li> <li>▪ Provide five 9's availability</li> <li>▪ Not take any specific actions that will prevent older legacy applications from operating. However, if legacy applications do not work within the technical design and the ultimate build out, there will be no special consideration to enable those applications (DecNet, AppleTalk, H.320 video, etc.). IP encapsulation, operating system or application system upgrades may be required.</li> <li>▪ "HIGHLY" encourage cooperation within each county (and various counties within each LATA) for Network Maryland to be a "network of networks" and for counties, state agencies, and other participants to cooperate and build a county network that is robust and cost effective overall. Be designed to support high bandwidth applications. However, because total capacity requirements are not readily available in time for the phase one build out, the Engineering subcommittee is being asked to build the network out based upon their estimates of a worse case scenario.</li> <li>▪ The Engineering sub-committee will review the recommended final design that is based upon available funding and the reality of construction capabilities with the Requirements group prior to final build out of Network Maryland. Ultimately, net.work.Maryland will meet the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Actual nwMd Requirements (Both signed by Advisory Group)</li> </ul> <p>Add Richard's quote to slide 24.</p>	

Reported By:	Topic / Discussion	Action	Completion Date
	requirements as defined by the various constituent organizations.		
R. Rose	<p><b>Engineering Committee –</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Users need confidence in the network</li> <li>▪ Architecture needs to be inclusive of current network usage, regardless of type of connection</li> <li>▪ There must be redundancy from both the networking and physical premise</li> <li>▪ POPS must be taken out of Central Office</li> <li>▪ IP and ATM addressing is a very big problem</li> <li>▪ First year success is paramount</li> </ul> <p><b>What will you get?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ ATM Protocol of Choice</li> <li>▪ ISP Interface in Each LATA –Rising Sun Connected with dedicated DS3 (not illustrated in drawing)</li> <li>▪ ATM – TCP-IP Redundancy or Keep Alive</li> <li>▪ Possible Load Sharing</li> <li>▪ Circuit Emulation for Legacy Systems</li> <li>▪ Online Menu of Services, Statistics, Topology, Trouble Reporting</li> </ul> <p><b>When will you get it?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Core Infrastructure: September 2002</li> <li>▪ ISP Service: September 2002</li> <li>▪ Customer Online Ordering, Help, Information, Statistics: <b>September - October 2002</b></li> <li>▪ Network Monitoring: September - October 2002</li> </ul> <p><b>How much will it cost?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Service should be = to or &gt; than</li> <li>▪ Cost should be = to or &lt; than</li> </ul> <p><b>What does all this mean?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Customers should want to connect because the alternatives to net.work.Maryland are too expensive.</li> <li>▪ We need State commitment at all levels of the government for full participation based on value and technical superiority.</li> <li>▪ We need private peering so education, government, health, and non-profits can do the exciting things that for now, we can only talk about.</li> <li>▪ Commodity ISP services need to be at Tier 1 levels</li> <li>▪ The network needs to be localized, but concept and design should be global.</li> <li>▪ We need for the State to tell us which contracts to use, and the services need to be ordered immediately.</li> </ul> <p><b>Phase II - Fiber</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Think in terms of an OCx around the State not OCx between</li> </ul>	<p>Customer Online Ordering, Help, Information, Statistics TBD</p>	

Reported By:	Topic / Discussion	Action	Completion Date
	<p>the LATA's</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most traffic is local, except for the commodity internet, higher education, libraries, and health, and specialized applications between State affinity organizations.</li> </ul>		
L. Burek	<p><b>Other Business</b> - The next meeting will be held on July 15, 2002.</p> <p><b>Regional Proposals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Network of Networks</li> <li>Discuss Criteria for Regional Proposals</li> <li>Requests for Usage of Fiber Being Handled Under Resource Share</li> </ul>	<p>Location of July's meeting TBD. Location of August 's meeting in Southern Maryland.</p> <p>Change "Regional" to something else (not identified).</p> <p>Regional proposal input needed in two weeks.</p> <p>Add regional proposal "address" areas to web site.</p> <p>3<sup>rd</sup> bullet belongs under "Resource Share" – DBM.</p>	
M. Burnette	<p><b>Cost Recovery Planning – Assumptions regarding</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capital costs of construction and implementation</li> <li>Customer's responsibilities</li> <li>Participation</li> </ul> <p><b>Shared cost</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"Shared" circuits</li> <li>Support and maintenance</li> </ul> <p><b>Rate Structure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Basis</li> </ul> <p><b>Roll Out / Implementation Period</b></p> <p><b>Meeting June 26<sup>th</sup> with Cost Recovery Working Group</b></p>	<p>Add Ron Forsythe to working group.</p> <p>Need to determine "what to bill"</p> <p>Alt 1) # of ports</p> <p>Alt 2) bandwidth</p>	
	<b>Adjournment</b> - The meeting adjourned at 2:11 PM		

**Minutes Recorded by:**  
Jodey McGhee